



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Dr. Plenkers, an intimate friend of Traube's, and for some years a member of the Benedictine order, now takes up the subject afresh, in preparation for an edition of all the early monastic rules, which he will publish in the Vienna *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum*. He has collated and studied MSS both known and unknown, particularly four Spanish MSS and a recently discovered Trèves MS of Benedict of Aniane. This Benedict compiled in the early ninth century a collection of various monastic rules (*Codex regularum*) as well as a *Concordantia Regularum*. From the Trèves MS we can now corroborate Traube's argument that Benedict had followed for the *Regula Benedicti* the Carolingian text. Plenkers' minute investigations confirm Traube's general results decisively. In only one particular does he find it necessary to modify them; he believes that the Σ recension is not the work of Simplicius or any one man, but is the result of a gradual process of error and emendation. But the instances adduced by Plenkers, it seems to me, rather prove than disprove Traube's views. Unless more convincing evidence can be shown, there is no need of a new hypothesis. In any event, it is now possible to edit, with few chances of mistake, the original autograph of S. Benedict. Dom Morin has already (1900) published the Sangallensis, with an apparatus of readings from the important Monte Cassino MSS. Plenkers' work contains other matters of interest and importance on Benedict of Aniane, on Holstenius and other seventeenth-century editors, on the transmission of martyrologies, and on the *Regula Cassiani*.

E. K. RAND

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Aristotle, De Sensu and De Memoria. Text and Translation with Introduction and Commentary. By G. R. T. Ross. Cambridge: University Press, 1906. Pp. ix + 303. 9s.

Dr. Ross's edition of the *De sensu* and *De memoria* is a revision of a doctoral dissertation presented to the University of Edinburgh, and as such is very creditable indeed. The text is that of Biehl, with slight changes which are noted. In 441 a 14 the editor conjectures πυρρουμένων "reddened" for πυρουμένων "ignited" of the MS. As a result of following Biehl so closely he sometimes gives an obviously wrong reading without supplying the means of correcting it. Thus in 436 b 18: τὸ γὰρ ἡδὺ διακρίνει καὶ τὸ λυπηρὸν αὐτῇ περὶ τὴν τροφήν, unless we are to have a new doctrine of the pronoun, αὐτῇ is impossible, and we must read αὐτῇ with the Berlin editors. Cf. 439 a 3: ἀντίκειται γὰρ τῷ ἐγκεφάλῳ αὐτῇ. Again in 448 a 17: ἀλλ' ὡς σύστοιχα, γένει δ' ἕτερα, we ought at least to be informed that the Berlin edition reads, καλῶ σύστοιχα. I have sometimes thought of ταῦτ' ὡς σύστοιχα.

The translation which accompanies the text, though not flawless, is

an improvement on all predecessors and shows a good understanding of the Greek and of Aristotle's technical terminology. The introductory essay on Aristotle's physiology and psychology of the senses is well written, and the commentary reveals a sufficient acquaintance with the Aristotelian literature of the subject. As a whole, then, the book will admirably fulfil its purpose which is to "meet the needs of students of philosophy who, not being expressly classical scholars, have hitherto had no adequate means of becoming acquainted with these two important works."

Reserving for another occasion discussion of some of the philosophical questions raised, I will confine myself here to the mention of a few passages in which I am unable to accept Dr. Ross's interpretation.

436 *a* 11 *ταῦτα* refers, I think, only to *ἡδονή τε καὶ λύπη*; if it explicitly included the preceding list *γάρ* would have been used instead of *καὶ γάρ*.

436 *b* 14, *ἰδίᾳ δ' ἥδη καθ' ἑκαστον*, etc.; not, "to each animal in its own proper nature touch and taste must necessarily accrue," but rather "proceeding now to speak of the special senses in each case." *ἰδίᾳ* opposes the discussion of the special senses to *αἰσθησις* in general. This is apparent from the following *ἡ μὲν . . . αἱ δὲ*, etc. See also Plato, *Tim.* 65 B, *τὰ . . . κοινὰ*) (*τὰ δ' ἐν ἰδίῳις μέρεσιν*. Perhaps we should read *καθ' ἑκάστην*. Cf. Michael ed. Wendland, p. 1, *καὶ ἰδίᾳ περὶ ἑκάστης τῶν αἰσθησεων*.

438 *a* 10, *οὐδέ πω δῆλον ἦν*; not, "but he (Democritus) seems to have attained to no clear general theory," etc. It is rather the science of his age which had not yet advanced so far.

440 *b* 30, *σχεδὸν γάρ ἐστι τὸ αὐτὸ πάθος οὐκ ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς*, etc., "while as subjective phenomena they are practically identical, their vehicle is diverse." This interpretation, for which the notes argue, is refuted not only by 443 *b* 14, *ὅπερ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι ὁ χυμός, τοῦτ' ἐν τῷ ἀέρι καὶ ὕδατι ἡ ὁσμὴ*, but also, I think, by Plato, *Tim.*, 67 E, *ἐκείνων παθήματα γεγονότα ἐν ἄλλῃ γένοι τὰ αὐτὰ*.

450 *a* 20, *ἐπεὶ οὐδὲ νῦν πᾶσι διὰ τὸ μὴ πάντα χρόνον αἰσθησιν ἔχειν*, "since as facts are, all living beings do not possess it, because not all have a sense of time." The meaning in free paraphrase is rather: (and this supposition that if memory depended on *νοῦς* it would be denied to many animals that now possess it need not surprise us) "since even as things are all animals do not possess it because all have not the sense of time." Dr. Ross's notion that *οὐδὲ νῦν πᾶσι* refers to God or the heavenly bodies who are above not below memory is fantastic. He argues that *ἐπεὶ* cannot carry any meaning analogous to that which I have given it. But a dissertation on *ἐπεὶ* would show that there are hardly any limits to its carrying power where the context supplies the matter of a transitional parenthesis.

449 *b* 34, *καὶ τούτῃ ᾧ αἰσθάνεται*, etc., "and the organ of memory is that which enables us to perceive time," rather: "and they remember by means of the organ by which they perceive time." It is so taken by Themistius.

453 a 7, διαφέρει δὲ τοῦ μνημονεύειν τὸ ἀναμνήσκεσθαι οὐ μόνον κατὰ τὸν χρόνον, "not merely in the superiority of the sense of time which it involves," with the comment, p. 284, "evidently to have recollection proper one must remember μέτρω." But it is not at all evident. All proper memory as opposed to mere μονή αἰσθήματος requires a definite consciousness of the past as does ἀνάμνησις, to accept provisionally Aristotle's unjustifiably rigid distinction. But it is impossible to see how ἀνάμνησις of a proper name for example involves a measured memory of the precise interval since the original experience more than μνήμη does. Themistius glosses κατὰ τὸν χρόνον by πρότερον γὰρ ἢ μνήμη τῆς ἀναμνήσεως. Michael takes it in the same way. And this simple interpretation is probably right.

PAUL SHOREY

Die Präposition als sinnverstärkendes Präfix im Rigveda, in den homerischen Gedichten und in den Lustspielen des Plautus und Terenz. Von KATHARINE VON GARNIER, geb. MOEWES. Leipzig: Privately printed, 1906. Pp. vi+65.

This pamphlet seems to be a pleasant example of the pursuit of "knowledge for the sake of knowledge." Mrs. von Garnier devoted herself to linguistic studies primarily for the sake of companionship with her sons, and thence conceived the idea of preparing herself for the doctorate.

Of the prepositions examined in the dissertation, the Sanskrit *āti*, *abhi*, *ū*, *pāri*, *prā*, and *vi*; the Greek *ἀμφί*, *διά* (ζά), *ἐξ*, *κατά*, *περί*, *πρό*, *ὑπέρ*, and lastly the Latin *com*, *de*, *per*, *prae*, and *pro* are found to have an intensive force in composition. This always bears some relation to the original local sense, yet prepositions of similar meaning do not necessarily develop alike in different languages. As the intensive force increases the local force diminishes. The first stage of development appears in composition with the verbs "to be" and "to become." This appears clearly in the *Rigveda*, is rare in Homer, and no longer existent in Plautus and Terence. The apparently intensive use of *ἐν* and *ἐν* is denied, that of *super* and *ex* ascribed chiefly to Greek influence.

There are occasional inaccuracies in quotation, and some misprints, none of which, however, is serious. A few changes should be made in the references: p. 36, l. 3 from the bottom read p. 436 for p. 430. In the third paragraph of p. 5 read VIII, 92, 6 for VIII, 81, 6, and in l. 6 from the bottom read VIII, 89, 6 for VIII, 78, 6 and VIII, 97, 9 for VIII, 86, 9. In the next line read VIII, 97, 10 for VIII, 86, 10 and VIII, 98, 2 for VIII, 87, 2. At the top of p. 43 read Merc. 143 for Men. 143.

IVY KELLERMAN